United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

75-7162

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

for the Second Circuit

JOHN F. COSTELLOE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

against

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,

Defendant-Appellee.



On Appeal from an Order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York

APPELLEES' SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

CHADBOURNE, PARKE, WHITESIDE & WOLFF Attorneys for Defendant-Appellee Trans World Airlines, Inc. 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, New York 10020 (212) 541-5800 PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 3 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK ----X 4 JOHN F. COSTELLOE : 5 Plaintiff : 6 against 75 C 157 7 8 T.W.A. Defendant : 10 11 United States Courthouse 12 Brooklyn, New York 13 February 7, 1975 11:30 a.m. 14 15 Before 16 HONOPABLE ORRIN G. JUDD, 17 U. S. D. J. 18 19 20 21 22 23 SHELDON SILVERMAN 24 Acting Official Court Reporter

25

Appearances:

JOHN F. COSTELLOE Pro Se 216 Little Neck Road Centerport, New York 11721

CHADBOURNE, PARK, WHITESIDE & WOLFF, Esqs. Attorneys for Defendant 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, N.Y.

By: HAROLD L. WARNER, Esq., of counsel

(In Chambers)

order for me just after these papers were served asking they be sealed and I thought the proper thing was to seal them and avoid any problem. Since then I have had a call from the Kansas City Star asking when the hearing was going to be weld, and this morning from the Wall Street Journal. I'm not sure how the news got out. I'm not sure ether you have anything to say, Mr. Costelloe with respect to the publicity on the matter. I held it in chambers because of Mr. Warner's statement.

Maybe you should say a little more, Mr. Warner, why you want this in chambers.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, I would have to say so much at the moment, but it's basically to protect the plaintiff in this case because of the matters in the moving papers and because, also --

THE COURT: You mean in his moving papers?

MR. WARNER: In his moving papers and my response.

MR. COSTELLOE: I haven't seen the response.

THE COURT: Have you any answering papers
this morning?

MR. WARNER: Yes, I do, your Honor.

24

25

2

THE COURT: Your response simply refers to what you call a vicious campaign against your firm and its clients referred to in a Southern District case which has been sealed and which I know nothing about.

MR. WARNER: I would like to --

THE COURT: Except that the action was used to force settlement of a claim for compensation as a tax consultant.

MR. WARNER: I would like to file our answering papers to the show cause order.

THE COURT: Suppose you give those to Mr. Costelloe right now.

MR. WARNER: I shall, and a cross motion to dismiss the complaint; also, of course, any adverse publicity might affect a \$100 million sale of aircraft and irreparably damage T.W.A.

THE COURT: I suppose the plaintiff may not be that much concerned about what's in your papers, but I have some concern about what the effect of this would be.

Is there any reason why I shouldn't go ahead in chambers, Mr. Costelloe?

MR. COSTELLOE: I think you should go ahead. I don't think there's any reason to seal.

THE COURT: Do you know anything about how this matter got to the newspapers?

MR. COSTELLOE: No, I don't. My office had a telephone call on Tuesday from a Mr. Ed Sullivan. It came in at about 11:45. My wife answered it. He had the name of the case and the number of the case and said he had seen it and he asked questions about it.

My wife said I was in the city and she knew nothing about it.

I next called Mr. Miles Cunningham the next day.

THE COURT: The U.S. Attorney's office?

MR. COSTELLOE: Yes. I worked with him on
the kickback matter.

I said I was much concerned of the leak,
particularly since my assistant and I were with
Judge Mishler on Monday, a reference to the leak
in the case involving an informant. I said I regretted any publicity in the matter and I asked for
his guidance. Unfortunately, he was on vacation.

Mr. DePetris, an Assistant, called back and I gave him the information and told him that I was concerned about the leak and that from Mr. Cunning-ham's information, since he will be back from

vacation on Friday, that there would be a hearing in Courtroom 11 at 11:30.

THE COURT: I don't know if there's any leak.

MR. COSTELLOE: There isn't any.

THE COURT: but had to file a complaint before you got to Judge Mishler or me, and the title and name and number are public documents.

MR. COSTELLOE: The only other person I talked to was Mr. Brown of the Internal Revenue Service -I'm sorry, Somers Brown is his full name. Then I had a call from Hemly Soloff of C.B.S. That was the night before last.

THE COURT: I have Mr. Warner's motion to dismiss, and I expressed concern when I signed the order to show cause about what your standing was.

MR. COSTELLOE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have anything to add to that?

MR. COSTELLOE: I own stock. I'm a creditor-THE COURT: You say your son owns stock?
MR. COSTELLOE: I say I'm the beneficial owner,
it's in his name as nominee.

THE COURT: How old is he?

MR. COSTELLOE: He was about seventeen when it was purchased. He's about twenty-one now. That's

23

24

25

2

3

a very rough recollection.

THE COURT: Let's see what the complaint says.

MR. COSTELLOE: That's paragraph 33 at page 9.

THE COURT: Well, I suppose you have an allegation in there that you're the beneficial owner of the stock. I don't know whether you have to be an owner of record to bring a stockholder's action or not.

Tell me about your motion to dismiss, Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, as will be seen by our answering papers, it is T.W.A's position that this action has not been brought in good faith. It has been brought by a pro se plaintiff's attorney who was formerly a partner of my law firm. He was a partner from March of 1958 until June 1 of 1968.

Thereafter, he served as tax consultant to our firm for a three-year term, ending December 31, 1971.

MR. COSTELLOE: Not a three-year term.

MR. WARNER: As such --

MR. COSTELLOE: Not a three-year term.

THE COURT: A little more, three and a half or so.

MR. WARNER: As such, he was privy to and handled tax matters on behalf of T.W.A. He is

?

therefore disqualified under the clear rulings of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from maintaining this action, whether as party-plaintiff or as attorney.

THE COURT: Even through it relates to matters -- the complaint does not relate only to the sale. It relates --

MR. WARNER: It relates to tax matters, your Honor. Paragraph 22. As a matter of fact, the complaint is replete with references to tax matters--

THE COURT: The injunction is directed to alleged misrepresentations of tax liabilities.

MR. WARNER: Yes.

THE COURT: So I think you're right.

MR. WARNER: Judge Kaufman in Emily Industries

v. Paten Tex, 478 F.2d 562, said, "The dynamics of
litigation are far too subtle. The attorneys' role
in the process is far too critical, and the public's
interest in the outcome is far too great to leave
room for even the slightest doubt concerning the
ethical propriety of a lawyer's representation in a
given case. These considerations require application of a strict prophylactic rule to prevent any
possibility, however slight, that confidential
information acquired from a client may subsequently

- 3

•

be used to a client's disadvantage."

In that case and the Meyerhofer -THE COURT: Is that in your memorandum?
MR. WARNER: Yes, page 6 and 7, your Honor.

Judge Kaufman said in that case, "A lawyer should avoid representation of a party in a suit against a former client where there may be the appearance of possible violation of confidence even though this may not be true in fact."

Much as I regret to say it, my former partner's bringing of this scurrilous lawsuit goes far beyond the bounds set by Judge Kaufman.

Mr. Costelloe has threatened and libeled the chairman of the board of T.W.A. He has telephoned and written to Mr. Raymond R. Fletcher, Jr., whose opposing affidavit I have submitted here, two telephone calls demanding payment of \$750,000, which Mr. Costelloe claims T.W.A. owes him for legal services rendered when Mr. Costelloe was a consultant to my firm. T.W.A. refused to make that payment of \$750,000, and ever since then has been the victim —a few examples are appended to Mr. Fletcher's affidavit here, of the most vicious letter writing campaign imaginable.

If Mr. Costelloe thinks T.W.A. owes him money

for legal services, let him sue T.W.A. for legal services. If he thinks my firm owes him money under our consulting agreement and despite the greatest provocation, we have paid him every penny due under that agreement, he has conducted this campaign in the sealed file before Judge Connor, he sued another of my firm's clients. That was an allegation that he had purchased stock and had been misled by the information that Sperry Rand Corporation had given.

Judge Connor dismissed that action, saying --

MR. COSTELLOE: Your Honor, that isn't so.

THE COURT: Let's stop, Mr. Warner.

MR. COSTELLOE: The cumulative effect concerns me.

THE COURT: Did you work as a lawyer on T.W.A. tax matters?

MR. COSTELLOE: On their tax matters, but nothing here involved, except --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. You say in your complaint --

MR. COSTELLOE: Except, your Honor -- Let me say the principal occasion is a kickback matter.

The kickbacks became illegal on December 10th of 1971.

Before that it was necessary to establish guilt of kickbacks. After that it was not. It first became

public in May of 1974, although my former partner, Spader, in November of 1972, when he confessed to his slush fund from American Airlines, said his slush fund with all the laundry was nothing in comparison to the evil of kickbacks. That's the first I heard of kickbacks.

In May of 1974 there was a newspaper account that airline executives, very clearly including T.W.A., were involved in kickbacks.

In December of 1974 there was introduced legislation which reflected my own suggestion to the C.A.B and the Department of Justice in conference that taxes and ticketing be tied together.

On December 21, '74, there was a newspaper account of confessions of kickbacks in the industry with a statement that had run to hundreds of millions of dollars.

On January 1st there was an account of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company which made an SEC statement acknowledging liability of \$11 million for diverdence of funds of some \$100,000 for political purposes, which gave tax benefits of only \$200,000.

Since then there has been a similar action by Ashland Oil to be sure its next directors' meeting would be valuable.

*

Since then there have been indictments of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company people. The point is that where there is any fraud, and a kickback is fraud per se, I believe under the circumstances the penalty attaches to the entire deficiency. That brings in two matters, something that I did work on. I worked on the pipeline matter and gave up, said I couldn't get proof that the matter existed. I said that in 1970. I quit the T.W.A. work then on that account.

The firm tried until July to establish the assets existed. Then it went into litigation, Chadbourne sued the United States Government for the T.W.A. in a matter involving about \$20 million differences in taxes and in a way directly opening up matters that I had settled for T.W.A. with almost complete success in the order of income adjustments of over \$100 million on an expressed quantum meruit basis, for which I received no payment and as to which T.W.A. has sought before Judge Connor to bar me from all courts for all times in all matters specified and unspecified and on which Judge Connor has refused that.

Mr. Warner renewed that attack on December 30th, the day before the Minnesota Mining matter,

is still pending before Judge Conn r. I think there is a flagrant felonious criminal obstruction of justice by Chadbourne, by T.W.A., by American Brands, by Anacenda, Gilbenco Foundation; I served them well, sir. They have interest, that war broke out, Russia is financing the other side. I served them in Kuwait and Iraq. I have them completely exempt from all U.S. tax, retroactively, saved them \$25 million. For that I got \$75,000 and a ruined professional reputation from my former firm. It had in it Mr. Spader, a confessed felon.

T.W.A. is notorious for political corruption.

I left partly on that account. The medication was,

when a senior Chadbourne partner --

THE COURT: Haven't you talked yourself out of the case?

MR. COSTELLOE: No.

THE COURT: You're saying T.W.A. is guilty of political corruption.

MR. COSTELLOE: It is.

THE COURT: You're suing T.W.A., your former client. Did the corruption start in 1972?

MR. COSTELLOE: I don't think it did. I went to the Nixon ball in 1969. I left the firm in '68 because this was coming. I knew nothing of the

7 8

corruption until it started to break. I first
learned of payment by Rodell to Mills in a ruling
matter in 1972. I stood off as well as I could.
I didn't bring this suit until the public interest
was threatened. I never sued T.W.A.

THE COURT: I'm inclined to think if there is that much public interest, there ought to be someone with less shadow on his reputation to bring it.

MR. COSTELLOE: Someone should, your Honor.

I know that --

THE COURT: You shouldn't instigate it, I think.

MR. COSTELLOE: I don't want to become implicated. They have done what they can. I want to be free of it, I want to sue them for my fee. I want to be clear of this. I would welcome other counsel.

I'd be glad to stand aside, stand out of it. But it shouldn't be made a secret, your Honor.

THE COURT: To the extent that it involves disclosure of things which are partly based on your services --

MR. COSTELLOE: No disclosure of anything that represents my services in this matter. I left them early in 1970 and the difficulties started to appear after that. I felt it might be coming, but I knew nothing of it. I do know, your Honor, that

T.W.A. is very probably insolvent because of the kickback matter. I do know the kickback matter is actively under two prosecutions under two grand juries in this district. I would like to get, if I could, your Honor, and I'd be glad to be out of the case -- I wish I were. I'd be pleased to sue for my fee and damages. That's all I want to do. I would like to have this turned over to other counsel, the U.S. Attorney, the Department of Justice, and the Treasury should know about it.

THE COURT: I don't know, as a matter of fact, turning it over to other counsel -- you're a pro se plaintiff, a little odd situation. If you're disqualified as counsel --

MR. COSTELLOE: I shouldn't be disqualified.

I'll appeal that if I have to.

THE COURT: You may be disqualified also as a representative stockholder to bring a derivative action.

MR. WARNER: That is precisely the holding of the Second Circuit in the Meyer Hoffer case.

MR. COSTELLOE: A lawyer has to tell. 1'd be glad to submit the SEC brief in that case. It's entirely different from what you're saying.

MR. WARNER: If I may get to the Meyerhofer.

*

case, I'll read it to you. It appears at 497 F.2d

1190. It's on page 6 of my memorandum where the

Court held, "The plaintiff should be prohibited

from acting as a party or as an attorney for any

party in any action arising out of the facts herein

alleged."

MR. COSTELLOE: That was just to clear him up as a witness. You have been a witness improperly in the Connor proceedings. You're being a witness here. What you're saying is not true.

THE COURT: What's not true?

MR. COSTELLOE: The substance of what he is saying is not true. There is no vicious vendetta.

THE COURT: The Meyerhofer case says that you should not be an attorney or a party to an action against a former client.

MR. COSTELLOE: In Meyer Hoffer, the lawyer found there had been a finder's fee for the firm of which he was associated. He was commended for that. The SEC said he was under criminal sanctions, required to do that. The litigants there got the file sealed and even the SEC sealed the file. I can show you an excerpt from the brief which will cast an entirely different complexion on the matter. Here, your Honor, I ceased connection with this

matter years before the two matters involved, the kickbacks, I knew absolutely nothing about. I would like, if I could, sir, to address you to public interest matter of the Pan Am-T.W.A. transaction. That should be made known to you apart from any fault of my own, which I deny. Can I state it?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COSTELLOE: I became active in this last Friday evening when John Chancellor said on TV that T.W.A. had sold six 747 aircraft, would sell more, making it about a \$200 million transaction.

According to the current press reports, that sale was known to have been negotiated completely for more than a week, but that disclosure was not made until after the C+A.B. approved a route swap, exchange. The route swap is one of the subjects the grand jury is investigating.

Given the news that T.W.A. was selling twothirds of its 747 fleet, it was clear that its intention was to abandon criminally, if it could, the international business.

Mr. Tillingast first complained
that the permission to restrain trade was not for
five years, given only for two years or until the
Transatlantic case was worked out. Then a statement

in position. T.W.A. would have the C.A.B. locked in. They wouldn't go back and pick up their old routes. Generally, T.W.A. takes Europe, and Pan Am takes the Pacific.

Then it was announced that the Iranians, who were purchasing these aircraft on terms we don't know, presumably on assumption of mortgages, had also bought a controlling interest in the Pan Am hotel business. You have to have both. They bought half of T.W.A. and half of Pan Am, insuring that they would get back in. Pan Am, in the meantime, negotiating with Pan Am to train the pilots for the F-14, which they bought from Grumman.

Grumman is signing over 3,000 people for two years, technicians. It's just been announced Pan Am just concluded a route restriction agreement with England. The New York Times this morning, focusing on Pan Am, said it would be too bad to let Pan Am go under, but we must not let money affect our foreign policy. The New York Times this orning --

THE COURT: What has this to do with the stockholders suit?

MR. COSTELLOE: Unlawful restraint of trade in the route swap unless the C.A.B approves. The

C.A.B. approval is good only as far as it is made on adequate disclosure, proper authority, and it's perfectly clear here the attempt to scramble the egg, produce a cooked omelet no court could untangle, any more than I.T.T. and Martford. They're trying to present the Court .--

THE COURT: Are you trying to be a private
Attorney General in here to enforce the antitrust
law?

MR. COSTELLOE: I have interest in air travel.

I have an interest as a stockholder, as a creditor.

I think this business is being criminally damaged without authority of the government and this court should satisfy itself that what is being done is either reversible or that it's clearly approved.

On the point of reversibility, the Administration is proposing that the C.A.B., for whom it has a very low regard, be deprived of its authority for this kind of exemption to the antitrust laws.

They're in favor of full competition.

The Administration bill will be introduced in six weeks and C.A.B. will no longer have power to do this, whether upon mistake, misrepresentation, or the clearest of disclosures, but T.W.A. is trying to do it to get a permanent injunction from the

antitrust laws which will destroy our overseas
sirline business and turn over a tremendous pool of
technology to Iran, which will be sold to the Russians
or anyone else, a more effective pool than we have.
What they are trying to do is affect criminally our
antitrust policy, our overseas airline business, our
whole technological orientation and deprive me to fly
as comfortably as well as the citizen of a smaller
country, but we're supporting Lufthansa and we don't
have an airline --

THE COURT: I suppose you can tell this to the Attorney General. I don't know why it brings you into this court as plaintiff.

MR. COSTELLOE: It damages T.W.A. irreparably. The court frequently is met with an antitrust proceeding and frequently it has the burden of, consent decree is made, which has possibility for correction, which has been done to meet the new situation, which clearly will exist when the truth is known.

I think this is an appropriate case to imposethere's nothing confidential about this, nothing confidential about kickbacks, nothing at all.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, if I may address
myself very briefly to that. When you have studied
Mr. Fletcher's affidavit, you will see why in the

interest of this pro se plaintiff he should wish withheld this matter were held. The threats against Mr. Fletcher, against Mr. --

MR. COSTELLOE: Show one. What went on.

THE COURT: Go shead with your statement.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Fletcher receives telephone calls from Mr. Costelloe --

MR. COSTELLOE: Can you give the text of one?

THE COURT: Let him speak.

MR. WARNER: Ever since T.W.A. denied

Mr. Costelloe's bill for \$750,000, whenever

Mr. Fletcher has tried to reason with Mr. Costellos,
in those telephone calls in which Mr. Costelloe

threatens all sorts of dire consequences --

MR. COSTELLOE: Completely untrue. That thing should be testified here by Fletcher.

MR. WARMER: He is always going to go to the United States Attorney's office. He's always going elsewhere.

When Mr. Fletcher tries to reason with him and say, "What can I do?" Mr. Costelloe replies, "Pay, pay, pay."

MR. COSTELLOE: It's complete lies, despicable.
How often have I been to the U.S. Attorney's office?

How often? Did Fletcher testify to that?

MR. WARNER: I say you have threatened.

MR. COSTELLOE: I have been there once in my life.

MR. WANNER: You have threatened Mr. Fletcher with going.

MR. CASTELLOE: That's not what you said.
You said I'm always going to the U.S. Attorney's office. Show me one threat.

MR. WARNER: With the last letter Mr. Tillingast got from Mr. --

THE COURT: This letter apprised --"constrained to apprise the Department of Justice there is a T.W.A.-Sperry obstruction of justice."

MR. WARNER: Exhibit D, to Mr. Fletcher's affidavit contains an example, merely an example, of the kind of aggravated harassment inviolative of the New York Penal Code, to which Mr. Tillingast and Mr. Fletcher have been subjected. Mr. Costelloe asked in particular where was there any threat to T.W.A. that Mr. Costello was going to bring this matter to the attention of Mr. Trager.

MR. COSTELLOE: I said what threats to Fletcher?

MR. WARNER: The threat to Fletcher is con-

for all times. Mr. Warner's motions of June and December. This was to Mr. Trager. I haven't yet sent it to Mr. Trager, but I haven't had a response. There has been no denial. It's a very serious matter. Lives are being lost.

MR. WARNER: To conclude, your Honor, the reason I ask for a confidential trial is for protection of this plaintiff. I think when you have finished reading that affidavit of Mr. Fletcher, which is an understatement of the unprofessional conduct, that this pro se plaintiff should be censured and disqualified from maintaining this action.

MR. COSTELLOE: A lawyer has a duty to disclose fraud or misconduct. The lawyer has the opportunity to defend himself. The lawyer is entitled to collect a fee. The confidence is only that required by law to be protected. There is no protection for people who are killers for lousy equipment. Your wings don't even exist. The pipeline assets are fake. You're worse than Homestake: people are flying on tired wings and dead engines, so you can suck off money to the travel agents.

THE COURT: I think somebody else ought to bring it, I think even with respect to matters subsequent to the time you say.

MR. COSTELLOE: May I sue for my fee?

THE COURT: All that's before me is a motion to dismiss a complaint and a motion for preliminary injunction. I'll say nothing --

MR. WARNER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Wait. I think even with respect to matters that arose after you say you dissociated yourself from T.W.A., matters in 1970, your claim against T.W.A. for a fee, which is still unresolved, I gather really makes you an improper party for a derivative stockholders action.

MR. COSTELLOE: This is not a derivative stockholders action.

THE COURT: What else is it?

MR. COSTELLOE: Suit to restrain -- there won't be any T.W.A. witnesses. It owes me something.

THE COURT: I don't think an unliquidated creditor has a right to interfere with a business.

MR. COSTELLOE: Any objection to my turning this trial over to the U.S. Attorney?

THE COURT: I can't stop what you do to the U.S. Attorney.

MR. COSTELLOE: Good. I've encompassed what I wanted. I'll sue you for fee and damages.

THE COURT: Let me hear from you, Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, I recommend to you very serious reading of Mr. Fletcher's affidavit.

I and my firm have a duty to our clients. When you see what this man has done --

MR. COSTELLOE: What exhibit is it?

MR. WARNER: It's Exhibit D. Just as a little example, Mr. Costelloe.

MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you. Where is this?
The affidavit.

MR. WARNER: This is his affidavit.

MR. COSTELLOE: This is a memorandum.

THE COURT: No, it's the affidavit.

MR. COSTELLOE: I see.

MR. WARNER: My clients are demanding --

MR. COSTELLOE: I haven't been incoherent.

THE COURT: Let me hear Mr. Warner, please.

MR. WARNER: My clients have been demanding and inquiring, indeed, the Gulbenkian Foundation, represented by Freshfield of London can't understand how clients can continue to be harassed in the manner Mr. Costelloe has --

MR. COSTELLOE: You misdated the lotter.

THE COURT: Wait a minute.

MR. WARNER: I have told them with pending litigation we cannot go to the bar association, but when this man comes into court and demonstrates what

he has done, his conduct is so unprofessional that he should be censured and he should be disqualified from maintaining this kind of action.

THE COURT: Two different things here. You have a motion to dismiss. You have an opposition for motion for P.I., motion to dismiss a complaint. You have a complaint, complaint about lawyer's conduct. Disciplinary matters go through the Chief Judge.

If you want to ask me on the basis of this whether I think I should refer it to the Chief Judge, I will consider that.

MR. WARNER: I most seriously urge it be done.

I recognize you cannot have digested what is but a

small portion. Were I to bring the file in, it

would be two feet high.

MR. COSTELLOE: Would you bring it, Harold?
Might I examine it?

MR. WARNER: With respect to one thing, I was hoping last June when we were in front of Judge Connor and you could see from the end of Judge Connor's opinion --

MR. COSTELLOE: Still pending before Judge Connor.

MR. WARNER: The case has been dismissed.

MR. COSTELLOE: It's pending since December 10th. You filed papers on December 30th. There's no

THE COURT: Please.

MR. WARNER: Northport, Long Island, New York, who demanded a copy of the complaint. Despite reiterated demand, Mr. Costelloe never filed any copy of the complaint. Finally, in December, Mr. Henry G. Ingram, who represented us in that action in Riverhead, moved to have the action dismissed for lack of prosecution and for failure to serve a complaint. Still, no complaint was filed and the Supreme Court --

THE COURT: You're far off from this action.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, I merely want to tell you what is in the background of a very complicated letter-writing campaign. He writes the chairman of the board of T.W.A. with copies to the chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board asking to borrow money from T.W.A. as an advance against what he claims my firm owes him.

THE COURT: You're off the motion now.

MR. WARNER: I certainly am, except --

THE COURT: That's disciplinary action.

MR. WARNER: Yes, except it tends to show why this man reads a newspaper or if you look at the sealed file, before Judge Connor, you will see that every time a newspaper article comes out, whether it

be a sale of Iranian Airliners or a crash of a

Lufthansa airplane, immediately it becomes the fault

of one of our clients. When Lufthansa crashes,

Sperry Rand ---

THE COURT: You're getting a little worked up, too.

MR. WARNER: I'm merely quoting the kind of letters in Judge Connor's file. This is what can be expected in this court if this action is permitted to be maintained by this man.

MR. COSTELLOE: It's not at all what he says.

I didn't file in Riverhead because the case was the same, the file was sealed, therefore I couldn't file.

It's hard to be dealt with under a sealed file.

THE COURT: What I'm going to do is dismiss
the present action which will result in a denial of
the motion for preliminary injunction.

I'll take under advisement Mr. Warner's request there be some disciplinary action as a result and I'll let you send me a letter of any sort you think is necessary beyond what the papers are already.

MR. COSTELLOE: How much time do I have for that?

THE COURT: With relation to whether this is anything that the Chief Judge of the District should

refer to any bar association.

10-

MR. COSTELLOE: I don't think that's fair, your Monor. I think there's so much more to the matter than that. I think that the United States' interests are being seriously harmed. I think I should appeal from that and not have it confused with any point of bar association at this part of the action. I'm convinced, your Monor, I will need more time but I say my own interests are secondary. I think the public interest in a kickback matter and the public interest, continuance of our airlines, has far greater precedence, and I wouldn't have acted without that. I didn't bring this action until that happened.

THE COURT: Let me just put this memorandum on the record.

Plaintiff has filed a complaint in this court alleging various types of misconduct on behalf of -- oh the part of Trans World Airlines (T.W.A.), including improprieties of the sale of 747 airliners to Iran, antitrust violations, misrepresentation of its financial condition, including failure to show tax liabilities which may be inconsistent with its financial solvency and violative of its covenants with debt service, airline kickbacks to travel agents.

and improper payment to the campaign find of Congressman Mills, among other things.

He Claims federal court jurisdiction under the Securities Act and as beneficial owner of T.W.A. common stock held in the name of his son, and as one who is being "prevented from proper use of airline travel by monopolistic combinations in restraint of trade outside any permissible exception."

He was moved for a preliminary injunction requiring T.W.A. to comply with the requirements of Rule 10-B-5 of the Securities and Exchange Commission in respect of its tax liabilities, and an injunction against consummating the sale or disposition of aircraft to the Government of the State or the Nation of Iran.

Defendants have moved to dismiss the action for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and in that connection have called attention to circumstances, regardless of the validity of the allegations in the complaint, that may disqualify plaintiff as a proper attorney or party to the action.

It appears without contradiction that plaintific was a partner of the law firm of Chadbourne, Park, Whiteside & Wolf from March 1958 to June 1, 1968; that he was a tax consultant for that firm thereafter

until December 31, 1971 --

MR. COSTELLOE: I did nothing after the early part of '70 --

THE COURT: (Continuing) That the firm has been counsel for many years for Trans World Airlines, Inc., and that plaintiff worked on tax problems for T.W.A. at least until sometime in the year 1970.

and has held the hearing on the motion in chambers because of concern both for publicity of the nature of current charges by the defendant against the plaintiff and because of concern with respect to the publicity about any of the matters until they are brought by a proper party.

The Court of Appeals has held that a former -MR. COSTELLOE: Don't you know I should be
allowed to give a memorandum.

THE COURT: You can appeal it. I am deciding it now.

The Court of Appeals has held that an attorney is disqualified to bring an action against his former client of to represent another party in such an action where it relates to matters in which the attorney previously represented the client and that "the dynamics of litigation are far too subtle, the attor-

,

.

ney's role in that process is far too critical, and the public's interest in the outcome is far too great to leave room for even the slightest doubt concerning the ethical propriety of a lawyer's reputation in a given case."

MR. COSTELLOE: I'm not representing, pro se.

THE COURT: Emle Industries, Inc. v. Pattenex
Inc., 478 F.2d 562 at 571 (2d Cir. 1973).

In Meyerhofer v. Empire Fire & Marine Insurance Co., 490 F.2d 1190, 1196 (2d Cir. 1974), the Court affirmed an order which prevented a former attorney for a client from acting either as a party or as an attorney for a party in any action arising out of the facts therein described.

some of the matters involved in the complaint and the application for an injunction have arisen subsequent to Mr. Costelloe's termination of any activity with respect to T.W.A. matters, but the complaint, as a whole, involves the possibility of delving so far into T.W.A. corporate matters and intercorporate and governmental relationships that it would be unseemly to permit him to act either as a party or as an attorney in the action. Although the action is brought pro se, it may even be regarded as action in the interest of his son Kevin Costelloe,

who owns the ten shares of T.W.A. stock which are involved with him acting as attorney.

Under the circumstances, the Court finds that Mr. Costelloe is: disqualified to bring this action, therefore does not reach the merits of the complaint or of the motion for a preliminary injunction.

This memorandum, together with the rest of the file will remain scaled.

Mr. Costelloe is not forbidden from bringing to the attention of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District or of any other governmental agencies which he sees fit any of the matters described, subject to the provisions of the code of professional responsibility with respect to publicity that might be given to any such step.

Mr. Costelloe is not forbidden from suing

T.W.A. or the firm of Chadbourne, Park, Whiteside &

Wolff for any sum of money that he claims is due to

him. Any problems that arise in such an action should

be considered by the court in which the action may

be brought.

Harold L. Warner, Jr., who appeared for the defendant in the action, has suggested that there are aspects of Mr. Costelloe's conduct with respect to T.W.A. that are unfprofessional and would justify disciplinary action. The Court makes no determination

on that but will give further study to the matter and will also consider any papers which Mr. Costelloe may submit on that subject. Rule 5 of the General Rules of this court refers all disciplinary matters to the Chief Judge, who may then refer them to the Bar Association. This Court will consider anything from Mr. Costelloe before determining whether even to bring this matter to the attention of Chief Judge Mishler.

It is therefore ordered, that the complaint be dismissed on the basis of the disqualification of the plaintiff and that the motion for preliminary injunction be denied as moot, the complaint having been dismissed.

I would like the court reporter to type
that out for me immediately and since the decision is in
favor of the defendant, I think the defendant should
pay for the transcript and Mr. Costelloe can get a
copy at copy charges.

MR. COSTELLOE: I request an evidentiary hearing.

I request an opportunity to submit memoranda. I think
that findings are in order. I admire your sense of
justice. I wish you would take a little time on the
matter. I think it's very important. I do ask for
an evidentiary hearing.

I haven't had an opportunity to submit an affidavit to answer papers that I first saw this morning, haven't read.

THE COURT: Do you dispute the fact that you were working on T.W.A. tax matters until sometime in 1970?

MR. COSTELLOE: In any relevant sense, yes, I deny it completely.

THE COURT: Any relevant sense?

MR. COSTELLOE: Yes, sir. I can only say, sir,
I'm a careful lawyer. You're not doing justice
to me or yourself.

THE COURT: You worked on T.W.A. tax matters involving hundreds of millions of dollars.

MR. COSTELLOE: I'm gravely concerned because felonies are committed. A lawyer is entitled to defend his name. There has been bribery behind my back, quite candidly, very serious criminal misdeeds.

I'm pleased to be free to apprise the United States

Government, because I have no interest in any vendetta.

I haven't sued these people. I have concern for human lives. I do think secrecy is overdone here.

THE COURT: I'm making no finding with respect to any improper threats that you may have made.

That's a matter --

'M. COSTELLOE: You haven't heard a word of sworn testimony, haven't given me a chance to reply to papers I first saw today. You're being unfair to me, myself, and I propose to appeal.

THE COURT: There is no relevant issue that has to be decided by evidentiary hearing. You have a right to appeal.

MR. COSTELLOE: Can I take exception to

Mr. Warner's testimony, comment on his acting as a

witness without -- abusing the seal of the file he

generated himself, the enormous abuse he has engaged

in that, the oil money behind this thing, you're

being seriously abused, your Honor.

THE COURT: I did not regard Mr. Warner as a witness. I regarded, I thought he was describing what was in Mr. Fletcher's affidavit.

MR. COSTELLOF: He has not. Can I have a transcript of what he said here?

chambers, I have taken it with seal to prevent it becoming public, but since he was attorney in the matter, he has a right to describe to another court in chambers hearing what was said.

MR. COSTELLOE: It's still pending, no final decision. He's misrepresented hundreds of thousands

of stockholders, the transcript, to be complete -THE COURT: There has been a full transcript
made. Anyone can order a copy of the transcript.

I asked Mr. Silverman to get out promptly the order.

MR. COSTELLOE: Might I have a transcript?
Will you share the cost?

HR. WARNER: Absolutely.

MR. COSTELLOE: How much time to I have to respond after I get the transcript?

THE COURT: You can take as long as you want to respond with respect to the disciplinary matter, thirty days if you want.

MR. COSTELLOE: Should I appeal forthwith?
THE COURT: I think it's within tharty days.

MR. COSTELLOE: No time to consider the transcript to get back to you?

THE COURT: If there are changes in the transcript, give notice.

MR. COSTELLOE: You will not entertain any argument or memorandum or authorities?

THE COURT: You may also move for reargument.

MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: I think I have not been over hasty.

I have decided on what I consider a narrow ground on undisputed facts.

MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you, your Honor.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

JOHN F. COSTELLOE,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Plaintiff-Appellant, :

Index No. 75-7162

-against-

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,

Defendant-Appellee. :

STATE OF NEW YORK

ss.:

COUNTY OF NEW YORK

Harold L. Warner, Jr., being duly sworn, deposes and says:

- 1. I am attorney for defendant-appellee in this case.
- 2. Pursuant to Rule 25(d) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, I hereby certify that I have served on John F. Costelloe, plaintiff-appellant, pro se, two copies of Brief for Defendant-Appellee and one copy of Appellee's Supplemental Appendix in conformance with Rule 31(b) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, by mailing the same on this 10th day of June, 1975 addressed as follows:

John F. Costelloe, Esq. 216 Little Neck Road Centerport, New York 11721

Harold L. Warner, Jr.
Attorney for Defendant-Appellee
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10020

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of June, 1975.

Notary Public